

Arguments

The inventors have made full effort to amend the patent filing so that it is compliant to standard formatting and guidelines. Regarding 1a on the reply filed on March 3, 2008 by examiner Rivas, the inventors were unable to respond in time; which lead to the unintentional abandonment. Based on a phone conversation with Mr. Rivas, the inventors filed a petition to revive.

Regarding 3a of the March 3, 2008 reply, the amendments do not change the scope or utility of the invention. The amendments were made in response to the reply filed by examiner Nicole L. Allen on March 18, 2004. In the original filing, claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 did not conform to standard formatting guidelines. This error was due to inexperience, since the inventors are not patent lawyers. The function of the nodes defined in claims 4 and 5 are consistent with Dr. Forgy's RETE algorithm and do not introduce new subject matter. Claim 21 and 29 were amended in response to the March 18, 2004 reply from examiner Allen.

In the reply from examiner Rivas on December 12, 2007, paragraph 3 stated the amendment introduced new subject matter "not contemplated in the original specification." The inventors added a summary of the invention; which should have been included in the original filing, but was left out due to inexperience. The inventors used electronic filing program provided by the patent office, which indicated the filing was properly formatted and contained the required sections.

The summary does not alter the functionality or utility of the invention. The summary attempts to explain the invention in greater detail so the examiner may get a better understanding. Regarding paragraph 5 of examiner Rivas reply, the proper markings have been made. All paragraphs and all claims have the appropriate markings in relation to the original filing. In response to paragraph 9 of the December 12, 2007 reply, the summary has been revised to include an explanation of Dr. Forgy's RETE algorithm. The detail description has also been revised to explain the invention in greater detail.

In response to paragraph 10 of the December 12, 2007 reply, claim 1 has been revised to follow the standard formatting guidelines and explicitly declares the components of the system.


In response to paragraph 11 of the December 12, 2007 reply, 3 diagrams were added to illustrate and explain the invention in greater detail. The summary and detailed description has been revised to explain the utility and functionality of the invention in greater detail.

In response to paragraph 12 and 13 of the December 12, 2007 reply, arguments section has been added to address the objections. The error was unintentional and has been corrected.

Regarding number 4 of the March 03, 2008 reply from examiner Rivas, the formatting of the claims has been revised based on the instructions of examiner Rivas to address the objection.

The inventors have made every effort to comply with patent filing procedures and standards with limited experience. The amendments do not change the functionality or utility of the invention. This response to the petition includes the patent filing with the necessary corrections.


Signatures of the Inventors

Signature:  Date: 3/27/09

Name: Peter Lin

Address: 88 Bjorklund ave, Worcester MA 01605

Phone: 508-864-0973

Signature:  Date: 3/19/09

Name: Said Tabet

Address: 24 Magnolia Rd Natick, MA 01760

Phone: 617-699-9188